



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/688,858	10/17/2003	Daniel L. Dunn	069090.1	9455
25763 7590 10/07/2011 DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP - MINNEAPOLIS ATTENTION: PATENT PROSECUTION DOCKETING DEPARTMENT INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PRACTICE GROUP - PT/23RD FL 50 SOUTH SIXTH STREET, SUITE 1500 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-1498				
EXAMINER				
LE, LINH GIANG				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3686				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/07/2011		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ip.docket@dorsey.com



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/688,858
Filing Date: October 17, 2003
Appellant(s): DUNN et al.

Brett A. Klein
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 22 July 2011 appealing from the
Office action mailed 23 February 2011.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The following are the related appeals, interferences, and judicial proceedings known to the examiner which may be related to, directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal:

Appeal No. 2008-4656 and Appeal No. 2010-001748.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is incorrect.

An amendment after final rejection was filed on 16 January 2009 and has been entered.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The examiner has no comment on the appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal. Every ground of rejection set forth in the Office action from which the appeal is taken (as modified by any advisory actions) is being maintained by the examiner except for the grounds of rejection (if any) listed under the subheading "WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS." New grounds of rejection (if any) are provided under the subheading "NEW GROUNDS OF REJECTION."

(7) Claims Appendix

The examiner has no comment on the copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the appellant's brief.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

2004/0024620	ROBERTSON	1-2003
2002/01888476	BIENVENU	6-2001

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertson(2004/0024620) in view of Bienvenu(2002/0188476).

3. As per claim 1, Robertson teaches a computer-implemented method for assessing risk the method comprising one or more computers performing the following (Robertson; Abstract):

receiving demographic data (Robertson; Pg. 2, Para. 27);

assigning the data to at least one risk group (Robertson; Pg. 4, Para. 64);

storing risk data for the patient (Robertson; Pg. 4, Para. 65);

calculating a risk score for the patient based upon the risk data and the demographic data of the patient (Robertson; Pg. 4, Para. 54).

Robertson does not expressly teach using prescription data for a patient. However this is well known in the art as evidenced by Bienvenu. In particular, Bienvenu teaches screening prescription history of an insurance applicant (Bienvenu; Pg. 1, Para. 17). It would have been obvious to add this feature to the Robertson method with the motivation of having an effective system and method for assessing prescription drug history information stored in the databases, processing the information and incorporating the information in the insurance process (Bienvenu; Pg. 1, Para. 7)

4. As per claims 2-9, Robertson teaches assigning data to at least one risk group and using risk marker's to calculate a risk score (Robertson; Pg. 2 Para. 27 and Pg. 4 Paras. 54 and 65). Robertson does not expressly teach using prescription data. However this is well known in the art as evidenced by Bienvenu. IN particular, Bienvenu teaches:

using national drug codes to classify each prescription. (Bienvenu; Fig. 5 and Pg. 5, Paras. 42 and 43);

categorizing each national drug code classification into one of a number of pharmacy risk groups (Bienvenu; Fig. 5 and Pg. 5, Paras. 42 and 43);

defining additional member risk markers based on patient age and other characteristics known to indicate that the patient belongs to a high risk category and using the additional member risk markers to calculate the patient's risk score. (Bienvenu; Pg. 1, Para. 4);

providing a clinical and demographic risk profile for the patient based on the patient's age, gender and a mix of clinical and demographic risk profiles and using the patient's clinical and demographic risk profile to calculate the patient's risk score (Bienvenu; Pg. 1, Para. 4 and Pg. 5, Para. 43).

providing multiple patient risk markers for patients with pharmacy services that indicate multiple medical conditions (Bienvenu; Fig. 5);

each risk group is assigned a numerical risk value based upon the patient's demographic data, and the patient's risk score is the sum of the numerical risk values of the risk groups in the patient's risk data (Bienvenu; Pg. 5; Para. 43);

wherein the risk score is computed using pre determined weights and a patient's patient risk marker profile (Bienvenu; Pg. 5, Para. 43);

wherein the pharmacy risk groups comprise patient risk markers (Bienvenu; Pg. 5, Para. 43).

It would have been obvious to add this feature to the Robertson method with the motivation of having an effective system and method for assessing prescription drug

history information stored in the databases, processing the information and incorporating the information in the insurance process (Bienvenu; Pg. 1, Para. 7)

Claim 10 repeats the limitations of claim 1 and the reasons for rejection are incorporated herein.

(10) Response to Argument

In the Appeal Brief filed 22 July 2011, Appellant make the following arguments:

A) The suggested combination does not disclose the present invention as claimed in the independent claims, and particularly the following limitations:

- 1) assigning the prescription data for each prescription to at least one risk group based upon at least one medical condition typically treated by the prescription.
- 2) storing risk data for the patient, wherein the risk data includes the risk groups for all prescription data of the patient;
- 3) calculating a risk score for the patient based upon the risk data and the demographic data of the patient.

B) There is no motivation to combine Robertson and Bienvenu

The Examiner will address the arguments in the order that they appear in the Appeal Brief.

Argument A:

In response to Appellant's argument, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). Examiner submits that the combined teachings of Robertson and Bienvenu teach the claimed invention. Examiner will discuss the particular reasons below.

Appellant argues that the combined references do not teach assigning the prescription data for each prescription to at least one risk group based upon at least one medical condition typically treated by the prescription. Examiner disagrees. Robertson teaches assigning the data to at least one risk group (Robertson; Pg. 4, Para. 64). Examiner admits that Robertson does not teach assigning prescription data to a risk group but brings in the Bienvenu reference for that purpose. Bienvenu teaches collecting and screening prescription of prescription history data by Pharmacy Benefit Managers for insurers to determine risks of an insured individual (see Pg. 1, paras. 4-

10). Thus, Robertson teaches the general risk classification technique and Bienvenu teaches the particular type of data (prescription history) to be incorporated with this technique. The motivation to combine these features is discussed above.

Next Appellant argues that the combined references do not teach storing risk data for the patient, wherein the risk data includes the risk groups for all prescription data of the patient and calculating a risk score for the patient based upon the risk data and the demographic data of the patient. Examiner disagrees. Robertson teaches the storing of risk data for the patient (Robertson; Pg. 4, Para. 65). Also, Robertson teaches calculating a risk score for the patient based upon the risk data and the demographic data of the patient (Robertson; Pg. 4, Para. 54). Again, Examiner submits one of ordinary skill in the art would combine the particular type of data (prescription history) taught by Bienvenu to the Robertson risk classification methodology.

Argument B:

In response to Appellant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re*

Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Examiner believes that the cited motivation of “having an effective system and method for assessing prescription drug history information stored in the databases, processing the information and incorporating the information in the insurance process” (Bienvenu; Pg. 1, Para. 7) is sufficient. Examiner believes that one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine the Robertson risk classification techniques with the Bienvenu prescription history system in order to have an effective prescription drug history system for an insurer as taught by Bienvenu.

In addition, as discussed in the *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc. et al.*, 127 S.Ct 1727 (2007), “[o]ften, it will be necessary for a court to look to interrelated teachings of multiple patents; the effects of demands known to the design community or present in the marketplace; and the background knowledge possessed by a person having ordinary skill in the art, all in order to determine whether there was an apparent reason to combine the known elements in the fashion claimed by the patent at issue. To facilitate review, this analysis should be made explicit. See *In re Kahn*, 441 F. 3d 977, 988 (CA Fed. 2006) ([R]ejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness’). As our precedents make clear, however, the analysis need not seek out precise teachings directed to the specific subject matter of the challenged claim, for a court can take

account of the inferences and creative steps that a person of ordinary skill in the art would employ" (emphasis added). One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine the teaching of Bienvenu and Robertson in order to have a complete system to insure risk of a healthcare patient. A person of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine the Robertson risk classification techniques with the Bienvenu prescription history system in order to assess a healthcare patient's risk effectively and accurately. As stated earlier, both references deal with insuring risk thus the specific techniques in Robertson are pertinent to the Bienvenu system.

Next, Appellant argues that Examiner's motivation to combine reference was made with hindsight. In response, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). Both references deal with insurance and classifying and determining risk. Robertson deals with automobile insurance but one of ordinary skill in the insurance art would recognize the principles of risk classification are applicable to insurance in any context, including health care.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/M. L./

Examiner, Art Unit 3686

9/20/11

/Gerald J. O'Connor/
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group Art Unit 3686

Conferees:

Gerald J. O'Connor /GJOC/
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 3600

Vincent A. Millin /vm/
Appeal Practice Specialist
Technology Center 3600